

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final Office action mailed September 8, 2009, claims 1 – 12 were rejected. In response, Applicants propose canceling claims 10 – 12 and adding claims 13 – 15. Applicants respectfully request that the proposed amendments be entered to put the claims in condition for allowance or to put the claims in better condition for appeal. Applicants hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the added claims and the below-provided remarks.

For reference, claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 and 112. Claims 10 and 11 have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejections moot.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1 – 6 and 8 – 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Force et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,533,123, hereinafter Force) and Sutherland (U.S. Pat. No. 6,292,898, hereinafter Sutherland) and further in view of Curiger et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,330,668, hereinafter Curiger) and Kuo et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,289,456, hereinafter Kuo). Additionally, claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Force, Sutherland, Curiger, and Kuo in further view of Beuten et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0018902, hereinafter Beuten). However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Force, Sutherland, Curiger, Kuo, and Beuten for the reasons provided below.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

“A microelectronic circuit arrangement intended for protecting at least one electronic component against illicit manipulation and/or unauthorized access, having at least one activating unit for checking that at least one activating condition is met and for activating at least one preventing unit that is also associated with the circuit arrangement and that is connected to the activating unit, by means of which preventing unit the component can be at least partly deactivated and/or at least partly destroyed in the event of illicit manipulation and/or unauthorized access;

characterized in that the preventing unit is arranged
(j=1) to prevent an internal oscillator from beginning to oscillate;

(j=2) to prevent an oscillator for an external clock signal from beginning to oscillate;
(j=4) to prevent the build-up of a high voltage; and
(j=7) to switch on an increased current drain in the operating state or the quiescent state.” (emphasis added)

The Office action cites Curiger as teaching “to prevent an internal oscillator from beginning to oscillate.” Although Curiger teaches “the device will reset and the on-board oscillator will stop clocking the device,” (col. 8, lines 8 – 10), Curiger does not teach or suggest preventing the on-board clock from beginning to oscillate as recited in claim 1.

The Office action cites Kuo as teaching “to prevent an oscillator for an external clock signal from beginning to oscillate.” Although Kuo teaches that “an alarm bit isolates the detection circuit oscillator from the circuit,” (Abstract, lines 4 – 5), Kuo does not teach or suggest preventing the detection circuit oscillator from beginning to oscillate as recited in claim 1.

Because Curiger fails to teach preventing the on-board clock from beginning to oscillate and because Kuo fails to teach the preventing the detection circuit oscillator from beginning to oscillate, Applicants assert that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 1.

Independent Claim 5

Independent claim 5 includes similar limitations to claim 1. Although the language of claim 5 differs from the language of claim 1 and the scope of claim 5 should be interpreted independently of claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that the remarks provided above in regard to claim 1 apply also to claim 5.

Dependent Claims 2 – 4 and 6 – 9

Claims 2 – 4 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1 and claims 6 – 9 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 5. Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 2 – 4 and 6 – 9 are allowable at least based on allowable base claims.

New Claims 13 – 15

New claim 13 is supported in Applicants specification by, for example, claims 5, 7, and 9 (as originally filed), and paragraphs [0038] – [0045] (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0090211 A1). Applicants assert that claim 13 is patentable over Force, Sutherland, Curiger, Kuo, and Beuten because the combination of prior art references does not teach switching on an increased current drain, blocking generation of high voltage, ignoring an external clock signal, and stopping an internal clock signal as recited in claim 13.

Claim 14 is supported in Applicants specification by, for example, claim 6 (as originally filed) and claim 15 is supported in Applicants specification by, for example, claim 8 (as originally filed).

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the proposed amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: November 5, 2009

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111